New-York Daily Times.

VOL. IV.—NO. 978. NEW-YORK, MONDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 1854. PRICE TWO CENTS.

THE NEW-YORK EVENING TIMES,
Published EVERY TUESDAY and FRIDAY, at $2 per year. Single copies may be obtained at the counter. This paper is made up from the same matter contained in the morning issues of the Daily.

THE NEW-YORK WEEKLY TIMES,
A FIRST CLASS NEWSPAPER FOR THE COUNTRY, is published every SATURDAY MORNING, at the low price of TWO DOLLARS per annum. The terms for FIVE COPIES DOLLARS, and a copy will be sent to any person who may desire to get up a club. Payment to be made in advance in every case. Postage on the WEEKLY TIMES one year, if sent by mail, one cent.

Single Copy ..... Two.
Single Copy for Country ..... Two.
Single Copy for Country, with Map of the United States ..... Three.

THE TIMES FOR CALIFORNIA.
A LARGE NEWSPAPER OF MUCH PAPER, is sent to any part of California, under the name of the NEW-YORK DAILY TIMES, for the low price of FIVE DOLLARS per month, in advance. Those wishing to advertise can find it to their interest to do so in this paper, as it is the favorite of every Mail steamer. Price 12½ cents per copy.

RAYMOND, HARPER & CO., Publishers.

New-York Daily Times.

THE CAMPAIGN.

TEMPERANCE RATIFICATION MEETING.

IMPOSING DEMONSTRATION.

Endorsement of the Nominations of the State Convention.

Speeches of Mr. W. H. Hodge, Rev. John Marsh, Rev. T. L. Cuyler, Horace Greeley, and Rev. Mr. Hatfield.

A large and influential meeting of the supporters and advocates of Temperance was held last Saturday night in the Tabernacle, for the purpose of expressing their concurrence in the action of the State Convention at Auburn, which nominated MYRON H. CLARK and HENRY J. RAYMOND, for the offices of Governor and Lieutenant-Governor, respectively.

Before the meeting was formally opened there appeared to be an anticipation on the part of some that the City nominations would be brought forward for ratification, and that considerable diversity of feeling would be exhibited thereon, but the event did not justify any such fears. The proceedings passed off without any interruption worth characterizing as serious, and with great unanimity.

Rev. Mr. MARSH called the meeting to order, and nominated W. H. HODGE for Chairman.

Mr. HODGE was chosen without opposition; and from a young gentleman in one of the front seats, whose hair, by and bye, standing "No" created much merriment and some disapproving hisses.

Mr. HODGE said: We are met tonight, fellow-citizens, on the threshold of Temperance on the eve of one of the most important elections, so far as we are concerned as Temperance men, that has ever taken place in our State. We are even here to-night, each, I trust, heartily to ratify the nominations of the State Convention. I trust that no suggestion of popular feeling will go out from this meeting that shall not fully be felt in our own City, but throughout the State. We have met to acknowledge who are known. I trust that there will be an approval of the nomination for Governor of this State so unanimous that it will be felt. The Temperance sentiment is worthy of the confidence of every intelligent man. I speak, from a personal acquaintance with Mr. CLARK of many years standing, (Applause, and a voice: declarative aye) Oh! (a No) He has been a consistent friend for the last fifteen years. He commenced life an honest, straightforward mechanic in the Western part of this State, and by his own energy and perseverance he has risen to the rank of one of our first Western merchants, and a man of influence, character and integrity wherever he is known. (Applause.) If elected, as I have no doubt he will be, he will honor the position he is to occupy, and he will honor our State. The name of the Lieutenant-Governor is one upon whom we all know, he has filled the office with honor to himself and credit to the State, and I have no doubt that he will receive the hearty and unanimous support of this meeting. (Renewed applause.) The meeting will now listen to the nomination of Vice-President and Secretaries.

Mr. MARSH submitted the annexed list of honorary officers, which was adopted almost unanimously,—the only dissentients being a few youngsters who occupied seats of the front seats immediately behind the reporters' table, and who appeared to be acting in concert with a small party which was scattered in other and more distant part of the house.

Vice-Presidents.

James Harper,	John Paterson,
Robert H. McCurdy,	S. T. Townsend,
Anson G. Phelps,	John R. Cornell,
Horace Greeley,	J. W. Kellogg,
E. P. Hevens,	George Hall,
Theodore McNamee,	Sebastian Meintzel,
C. C. Leigh,	James Mackrell,
Jeremiah Terbell,	A. R. Wetmore,
Thomas Denny,	Samuel Jones,
John W. Oliver,	M. B. Hovier,
E. W. Jackson,	W. W. Cornell,
Robert W. Hartley,	

Secretaries.

John Marsh,	Lucian Burleigh,
C. Hoover,	Albert Hogeet, Jr.
C. J. Warren,	

MR. MARSH'S SPEECH.

Rev. JOHN MARSH, one of the Secretaries of the meeting, was then introduced by the Chairman, and said:

MR. CHAIRMAN AND FELLOW-CITIZENS: At the Auburn Convention—the State Temperance Convention—the following resolutions were unanimously adopted as a basis of action. It is proper that I should read them so that your approval may be asked this evening. (Mr. MARSH here read the resolutions adopted at the State Temperance Convention held at Auburn, and which have been already published.) He then continued: The Convention, Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen, at Auburn, was not called for political purposes; not to nominate an independent ticket, nor to sustain any particular political party. It was called as a Convention of independent men to examine the fitness of all political parties and, if they could find on any of those tickets men reliable for the enactment and enforcement of a Prohibitory Liquor law like the Maine Law, they were resolved, irrespective of party politics, to support such at the election on Tuesday next. On examining the various tickets they found three candidates for Governor—Governor SEYMOUR, Judge ROSEBOOM and Mr. CLARK. Mr. SEYMOUR—(Laughter.) Mr. SEYMOUR was not their choice anywhere. (Laughter.) mingled with cheers, counter cheers and hisses.) In Governor SEYMOUR—I mean politically, gentlemen—(Hisses)—in Governor SEYMOUR they had no hope of a Prohibitory law while the world should stand. Judge ROSEBOOM declared himself in favor of a honor regulated license system—great gin palaces for instance, giving a thousand dollars for the monopoly—but that would not suit. Mr. CLARK was the only temperance candidate, and he was known to be a man who had done more than any other man in the State or the Legislature of the State of New-York to bring up the Maine Law,—thoroughly dyed in the wool as a temperance man. Under the circumstances, he was nominated by acclamation, and with wonderful unanimity. (Cheers and hisses.) In the nominations for Lieutenant-Governor, they found four candidates: Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. FOOT, Mr. WOOD, of Albany, and Mr. RAYMOND, of New-York. Mr. LUDLOW was considered as the same with Governor SEYMOUR. Mr. FOOT was reported to them as a local politician—was not a Maine Law man, but as one who would not pledge himself to sustain such a law. Mr. WOOD had been known for twenty-five years as one of the most substantial temperance men in the State, and a man who would discharge any duty which might be imposed upon him in relation to such a law. Mr. RAYMOND, who was an entire stranger, had been nominated by the State Temperance Convention, and, in reply to questions from them, he wrote the following letter, which was read before the Convention:

NEW-YORK, Monday, Sept. 25, 1854.

DEAR SIR: Your favor of the 21st has received me at this place. I answer both the inquiries in the affirmative. I am in favor of the principle embodied in the Maine Law, and am decidedly in favor of a prohibitory law; and in the contingency of my election, I should have no difficulty and sign the bill. I have also said that such a law would receive my support at any political position which I might occupy. I am very respectfully, your obedient servant,

HENRY J. RAYMOND.

That, of course was satisfactory to the Convention. There were then two candidates before the Convention for Lieutenant-Governor, Mr. RAYMOND and Mr. WOOD. The question was the consideration of resolutions unanimously approved, whereupon the vote being taken, every man present rose up and voted and giving his vote aloud was, as I understood, unanimous. (Cheers.) Now, fellow-citizens, I have no doubt that we will receive the hearty and unanimous support of this meeting. (Renewed applause.) The meeting will now listen to the nomination of Vice-Presidents and Secretaries.

Mr. MARSH submitted the annexed list of honorary officers, which was adopted almost unanimously,—the only dissentients being a few youngsters who occupied seats of the front seats immediately behind the reporters' table, and who appeared to be acting in concert with a small party which was scattered in other and more distant part of the house.

Vice-Presidents.

James Harper,	John Paterson,
Robert H. McCurdy,	S. T. Townsend,
Anson G. Phelps,	John R. Cornell,
Horace Greeley,	J. W. Kellogg,
E. P. Hevens,	George Hall,
Theodore McNamee,	Sebastian Meintzel,
C. C. Leigh,	James Mackrell,
Jeremiah Terbell,	A. R. Wetmore,
Thomas Denny,	Samuel Jones,
John W. Oliver,	M. B. Hovier,
E. W. Jackson,	W. W. Cornell,
Robert W. Hartley,	

Secretaries.

John Marsh,	Lucian Burleigh,
C. Hoover,	Albert Hogeet, Jr.
C. J. Warren,	

MR. MARSH'S SPEECH.

Rev. JOHN MARSH, one of the Secretaries of the meeting, was then introduced by the Chairman, and said:

MR. CHAIRMAN AND FELLOW-CITIZENS: At the Auburn Convention—the State Temperance Convention—the following resolutions were unanimously adopted as a basis of action. It is proper that I should read them so that your approval may be asked this evening. (Mr. MARSH here read the resolutions adopted at the State Temperance Convention held at Auburn, and which have been already published.) He then continued: The Convention, Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen, at Auburn, was not called for political purposes; not to nominate an independent ticket, nor to sustain any particular political party. It was called as a Convention of independent men to examine the fitness of all political parties and, if they could find on any of those tickets men reliable for the enactment and enforcement of a Prohibitory Liquor law like the Maine Law, they were resolved, irrespective of party politics, to support such at the election on Tuesday next. On examining the various tickets they found three candidates for Governor—Governor SEYMOUR, Judge ROSEBOOM and Mr. CLARK. Mr. SEYMOUR—(Laughter.) Mr. SEYMOUR was not their choice anywhere. (Laughter.) mingled with cheers, counter cheers and hisses.) In Governor SEYMOUR—I mean politically, gentlemen—(Hisses)—in Governor SEYMOUR they had no hope of a Prohibitory law while the world should stand. Judge ROSEBOOM declared himself in favor of a honor regulated license system—great gin palaces for instance, giving a thousand dollars for the monopoly—but that would not suit. Mr. CLARK was the only temperance candidate, and he was known to be a man who had done more than any other man in the State or the Legislature of the State of New-York to bring up the Maine Law,—thoroughly dyed in the wool as a temperance man. Under the circumstances, he was nominated by acclamation, and with wonderful unanimity. (Cheers and hisses.) In the nominations for Lieutenant-Governor, they found four candidates: Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. FOOT, Mr. WOOD, of Albany, and Mr. RAYMOND, of New-York. Mr. LUDLOW was considered as the same with Governor SEYMOUR. Mr. FOOT was reported to them as a local politician—was not a Maine Law man, but as one who would not pledge himself to sustain such a law. Mr. WOOD had been known for twenty-five years as one of the most substantial temperance men in the State, and a man who would discharge any duty which might be imposed upon him in relation to such a law. Mr. RAYMOND, who was an entire stranger, had been nominated by the State Temperance Convention, and, in reply to questions from them, he wrote the following letter, which was read before the Convention:

NEW-YORK, Monday, Sept. 25, 1854.

DEAR SIR: Your favor of the 21st has received me at this place. I answer both the inquiries in the affirmative. I am in favor of the principle embodied in the Maine Law, and am decidedly in favor of a prohibitory law; and in the contingency of my election, I should have no difficulty and sign the bill. I have also said that such a law would receive my support at any political position which I might occupy. I am very respectfully, your obedient servant,

HENRY J. RAYMOND.

That, of course was satisfactory to the Convention. There were then two candidates before the Convention for Lieutenant-Governor, Mr. RAYMOND and Mr. WOOD. The question was the consideration of resolutions unanimously approved, whereupon the vote being taken, every man present rose up and voted and giving his vote aloud was, as I understood, unanimous. (Cheers and hisses

New-York Daily Times, Saturday, November 6, 1854.

NEW-YORK CITY.

LAW INTELLIGENCE.

LONG ISLAND.

LATEST INTELLIGENCE

SPECIAL NOTICES.

BOARDING.

WANTED.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

FURS.

FANCY GOODS, STATIONERY

GAS FIXTURES, LAMPS, &c.

MAGNETIC POWDERS.

FARO PLAYING CARDS.

HOUSES, &c. WANTED

LOST AND FOUND.

BUSINESS CHANCES.

MILLINERY.

DRY GOODS.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

New-York Daily Times.

NEW-JERSEY.

THE CHURCH vs. YOUNG MEN AND BOYS.—Rev. Mr. Bolmington and the Meagher Explosion Groundwork.

In the course of the services in St. Peter's Catholic Church, Jersey City, yesterday, Rev. Mr. Bolmington, Father Kelly's senior assistant, delivered a sermon, the concluding portion of which referred to the proceedings of the Meagher Republican Committee at their ball on the previous Tuesday, a report of which was furnished in the DAILY TIMES of the following day.

The reverend gentleman took his text from that portion of the 22d Chapter of St. Matthew, in which Jesus is recorded to have said to the Pharisees who tempted him by asking if it were lawful to pay tribute to CESSAR or not: "Render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and render unto God the things that are God's." The reverend preacher began his discourse by pointing out the disposition with which the people should be actuated in order to gain the benefits of the jubilee. There was only one sin, he said, which excluded a man from the mercy of God—one sin which was not forgiven and never forgiven. It was that sin of which Christ spoke when he said, "Every sin, even the sin of blasphemy against the son of God shall be forgiven, neither in this world nor in the world to come." This was the only sin which excluded a man from the sacraments—which excluded him from all the favors of our Holy Church—which excluded him from the mercy of God who is all merciful—and which, if not repented of and asked not, excluded him irrevocably from eternal happiness. There were different ways, as they all knew, in which sin could be committed. The first was presumption on God's mercy hereafter, without showing by repenting of it here. The second way was by despairing of God's mercy, on the Protestant principle that no man is able to fulfill the commandments of God. These two heads were treated at length and effectively by the reverend preacher, after which he proceeded to the third way in which the sin might be committed, and proceeded as follows: The third way of committing the sin against the Holy Ghost is by an ultimate stubbornness against salutary admonition, even of the Church. You know, my dear brethren, that Christ has instituted a Church, that He gave his Apostles the power to bind and to loose, that He commanded them to teach all nations, and in teaching them not only spiritual doctrines, but he expressly said, "Go ye and teach all nations, and teach them to observe to keep whatsoever I have commanded of you." Then not merely doctrines but also were the keeping of the commandments in which He commanded His apostles to teach and to inculcate over the world. If such, then, be the case, and if any man refuses to hear the Apostles, if he refuses to submit himself to the authority which Christ manifested upon His Church—upon the Church of Apostles, of whom he appointed a visible head on earth, of whom he promised the Holy Ghost, for Christ promised the Holy Ghost to His apostles. And here I may observe, my dear brethren, that this Church throughout all ages, and as long as she exists (that is, to the end of time) has always condemned, and will always condemn that principle of indifferentism and of religious liberty which has been proclaimed and expressed during this week in this very City, and by a member of this very congregation. The principle sounds in this country like a charter to all sects, as merely spiritual. I submit to the Church is in all matters purely spiritual but as a public man, in any public capacity, I refuse to submit. I have a political duty to perform, which I owe, for instance, to the State or to the Union, and this duty I will perform." Now, my dear brethren, I have no doubt that the man who pronounced that declaration was entirely ignorant that he pronounced an extreme absurdity. But this absurdity, I have no doubt, he has said in the papers. It is contained in many public speeches. It can be read by many people, and heard publicly from many speakers. They would make a distinction between man as a spiritual being, constituted in his religious relations, and man in his public life. Any spirit they will allow him to be a Christian of any denomination, but as a public man they think he is by no means bound by any law of God or by any ordination of Christ. As a public man he can do however he pleases, and he thinks that however much on earth has a right to interfere with his doings, however wicked, however criminal they may be, if they do those acts under the pretence of their law of liberty. Now, my dear brethren, I have nothing to say against any man's having a solemn duty to perform in this State or to this Union. On the contrary, as I said last Sunday, every man is obliged, under a moral sin, to fulfil the duties which he owes to the State and to the Union, and in that relation I attended to those who had anything to do with revolutionizing foreign countries, and I said that they committed a sin, because by doing so they were up against the express laws of the Church. But, my dear brethren, for what reason did I introduce with the discussion of the subject, any military company? I think it is unnecessarily ridiculous to say that it is a solemn duty of a military company to dance, and that they owe a solemn duty of dancing to the State of New-Jersey or to the Union. Do you really think that this is a solemn duty which any army would boast of? Did you ever see a solemn duty of dancing in the State of New-Jersey or to the Union. Do you really think that this is a solemn duty for any military company to dance, and that they owe a solemn duty of dancing to the State of New-Jersey or to the Union. Do you really think that this is a solemn duty which any army would boast of? Did you ever see a military company to dance, and that they were up for the purpose of dancing, and that is adopted [illegible] as one of its essential and principal duties? Did you ever hear in any foreign country that any military company was founded for any other purpose than to defend their own country? And this, I think, is likewise the case here. All military companies are established to defend, and are bound to defend this country here, but not at all to revolutionize foreign countries. This latter is not their duty. They have not been founded together that they should act as revolutionists in foreign countries. But they have been founded together, and trained to the profession of arms, for the purpose, if anything should happen in this country, or if the State should require their services, [illegible] when called upon, they may be ready to perform their duty to the country and to the State of New-Jersey. This is their solemn duty, as I understand it, and I think I am right, and I believe every intelligent man will coincide in my opinion. Therefore let them not talk such nonsense and foolishness as that it is a solemn duty that they should dance, and a solemn duty that they should revolutionize foreign countries. This is not a solemn duty of any military body or of any other body in any country. In what way then, did I introduce? Did I tell them they should wear a white coat, or a red coat, or a grey coat? Did I tell them they should wear cocked hats, or that they should go over and storm New-York City? Did I command them what they should do with their funds? Did I give them an order to disband their Company? No such thing! I leave it to every body to say how they spend their money. I have nothing to do with their internal affairs, or with what clothes they wear, or how they manage their own business. I have nothing to do, nor have I ever assumed the right of giving them any orders, or commanding them in purely spiritual things. But, my dear brethren, is is the first time in my life I have heard that preaching is a military affair. That is the first consideration that presents itself on this matter. There is likewise another aspect of it. He says in purely spiritual matters he readily submits, but not as a public man. Now what are those spiritual matters? Are they purely spiritual? He is not himself. And how can he come to me as a pure layman or how can I come to him as a pure layman, when we are both members of the Church? Is he not bound by any laws of the Church? Is he not bound by any ordination of Christ? As a public man he can do however he pleases, and he thinks that however much on earth has a right to interfere with his doings, however wicked, however criminal they may be, if they do those acts under the pretence of their law of liberty. Now, my dear brethren, I have nothing to say against any man's having a solemn duty to perform in this State or to this Union. On the contrary, as I said last Sunday, every man is obliged, under a moral sin, to fulfil the duties which he owes to the State and to the Union, and in that relation I attended to those who had anything to do with revolutionizing foreign countries, and I said that they committed a sin, because by doing so they were up against the express laws of the Church. But, my dear brethren, for what reason did I introduce with the discussion of the subject, any military company? I think it is unnecessarily ridiculous to say that it is a solemn duty of a